

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, 26, and 30 are in independent form. Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15, 18, 21, 22, 26, and 30 have been amended to define Applicant's invention more clearly. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,181,436 to Kurachi.

Claim 1 is directed to a server apparatus adapted to communicate with at least one client, each client including an image storage unit for storing print data of a print job, and a printer via a network. Image storage means stores the print data of the print job to be executed according to a print request from a client, and order management means manages a print order of the print job to be executed according to the print request from the client. Transmission means transmits transmission permission information to the client based on the print order managed by the order management means, the transmission permission information indicating that the print data may be transmitted to the printer. Determination means determines whether an end command in response to the transmission permission information is received from the client within a predetermined time. Control means transmits the print data of the print job of the print order from the image storage means to the printer when the determination means determines that the end command is not received. Support for Claim 1 is found in the specification, at least at pages 10-24 (the "first embodiment").

One notable feature of Claim 1 is that both the server apparatus and the client apparatus have spool functions for storing print data of a print job. In particular, in Claim 1, both the server apparatus and the client store the print data, and if an end command is not received from the client within a predetermined time, the print data is transmitted from the image storage means to the printer. By virtue of this feature, transmission of the print image to the printer is guaranteed, even if the client is down.

Kurachi, as understood by Applicant, relates to a print managing system and print managing method. Kurachi discusses a print managing system having a plurality of clients and a printer. In Kurachi, each client generates and sends print data of a print job, and the printer produces the rough image of the print data and sends the rough image with management information to the client in response to a request signal from the client. The client displays the rough image with the management information on its display. The printer can apparently be replaced by a set of printing apparatus and a server.

Applicant notes that, in Kurachi, the print data is stored only in the print data storing means 3a in the printer apparatus (server) 3 (see, e.g., Fig. 1). The client generates and sends the print data, but does not store the print data.

The Examiner asserts that the RAM in Fig. 2B corresponds to the image storing means of Claim 1, and cites column 11, lines 60-67, to column 12, lines 1-15, of Kurachi. However, Applicant notes that these descriptions relate to the function of the server, and hence there is no description or indication in which the print data is also stored in the client. In

Kurachi, the RAM in the client is used to temporarily store the data necessary for the CPU and the like (see, e.g., column 7, lines 48-53 of that patent), and therefore, after the generated print data has been sent to the print data storing means 3, no print data remains in the RAM.

Applicant has found nothing in Kurachi that would teach or suggest that both the server apparatus and the client store the print data, and if an end command is not received from the client within a predetermined time, the print data is transmitted from the image storage means to the printer, as in Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 1 is not anticipated by Kurachi, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent Claims 4 and 7 are method and storage medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

Claim 8 is directed to an information processing apparatus as a client that communicates with a server apparatus, which manages a print order, and a printer via a network. Sending means sends job information, which does not include print data, to the server apparatus so that the server apparatus manages a print order according to the job information. Image storage means stores print data of a print job corresponding to the job information after the sending means sends the job information. Selection means causes a user to select a spool function of the image storage means or a spool function of the server apparatus, which is adapted to store the print data of the print job to be executed according to the print request to the server

apparatus. Determination means determines whether the spool function of the image storage means is selected or the spool function of the server apparatus is selected by the selection means. Control means is provided for, if it is determined by the determination means to use the spool function of the server apparatus, transmitting the print data to the server apparatus, whereas, if it is determined by the determination means to use the spool function of the image storage means, controlling the image storage means to store the print data and controlling the sending means to send the job information. Receiving means receives transmission permission information from the server apparatus indicating that the print data may be transmitted to the printer. Transmission means transmits the print data to the printer when the receiving means receives the transmission permission information from the server apparatus. Support for Claim 8 is found in the specification, at least at pages 24-27 (the “second embodiment”).

One important feature of Claim 8 is that both the server apparatus and the client apparatus have spool functions for storing print data of a print job. In particular, in Claim 8, one of the spool functions of the server apparatus and the client is selected by a user, and the image storage means in the client stores the print data of the print job corresponding to the job information, after sending the job information. By virtue of this feature, the user can select the spool function to be used, and if the spool function of the client is selected, the print data can be accessed after sending the job information.

As explained above, Kurachi discusses a print managing system having a plurality of clients and a printer. In Kurachi, each client generates and sends print data of a print job, and

the printer produces the rough image of the print data and sends the rough image with management information to the client in response to a request signal from the client. The client displays the rough image with the management information on its display. The printer can apparently be replaced by a set of printing apparatus and a server.

Applicant notes that, in Kurachi, the print data is stored only in the print data storing means 3a in the printer apparatus (server) 3 (see, e.g., Fig. 1). The client generates and sends the print data, but does not store the print data.

The Examiner asserts that the RAM in Fig. 2B corresponds to the image storing means of Claim 8, and cites column 11, lines 60-67, to column 12, lines 1-15, of Kurachi. However, Applicant notes that these descriptions relate to the function of the server, and hence there is no description or indication in which the print data is also stored in the client. In Kurachi, the RAM in the client is used to temporarily store the data necessary for the CPU and the like (see, e.g., column 7, lines 48-53 of that patent), and therefore, after the generated print data has been sent to the print data storing means 3, no print data remains in the RAM.

Applicants have found nothing in Kurachi that would teach or suggest that one of the spool functions of the server apparatus and the client is selected by a user, and the image storage means in the client stores the print data of the print job corresponding to the job information, after sending the job information, as recited in Claim 8.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 8 is not anticipated by Kurachi, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent Claims 11 and 14 are method and storage medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 8, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 8.

Claim 15 is directed to an information processing apparatus as a client that communicates with a server apparatus, which manages a print order, and a printer via a network. Image storage means stores print data of a print job to be executed according to a print request. Determination means determines to use one of a spool function of the image storage means and a spool function of the server apparatus based on a condition of the image storage means, the spool function being adapted to store the print data of the print job to be executed according to the print request to the server apparatus. Control means is provided for, if the determination means determines to use the spool function of the server apparatus, transmitting the print data to the server apparatus, whereas, if the determination means determines to use the spool function of said image storage means, controlling the image storage means to store the print data. Receiving means receives transmission permission information from the server apparatus indicating the print data may be transmitted to the printer. Transmission means transmits the print data to the printer when the receiving means receives the transmission permission information from the server apparatus. Support for Claim 15 is found in the specification, at least at pages 27-31 (the “third embodiment”).

One important feature of Claim 15 is that both the server apparatus and the client apparatus have spool functions for storing print data of a print job. In particular, in Claim 15, the

client can determine whether the image data of the print job is stored in the client or the server based on the condition of the image storage means. By virtue of this feature, the spool function to be used is automatically determined without any user interaction.

As explained above, Kurachi discusses a print managing system having a plurality of clients and a printer. In Kurachi, each client generates and sends print data of a print job, and the printer produces the rough image of the print data and sends the rough image with management information to the client in response to a request signal from the client. The client displays the rough image with the management information on its display. The printer can apparently be replaced by a set of printing apparatus and a server.

Applicant notes that, in Kurachi, the print data is stored only in the print data storing means 3a in the printer apparatus (server) 3 (see, e.g., Fig. 1). The client generates and sends the print data, but does not store the print data.

The Examiner asserts that the RAM in Fig. 2B corresponds to the image storing means of Claim 15, and cites column 11, lines 60-67, to column 12, lines 1-15, of Kurachi. However, Applicant notes that these descriptions relate to the function of the server, and hence there is no description or indication in which the print data is also stored in the client. In Kurachi, the RAM in the client is used to temporarily store the data necessary for the CPU and the like (see, e.g., column 7, lines 48-53 of that patent), and therefore, after the generated print data has been sent to the print data storing means 3, no print data remains in the RAM.

Applicants have found nothing in Kurachi that would teach or suggest that the

client can determine whether the image data of the print job is stored in the client or the server based on the condition of the image storage means, as in Claim 15.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 15 is not anticipated by Kurachi, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent Claims 18 and 21 are method and storage medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 15, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 15.

Claim 22 is directed to an information processing apparatus as a client that communicates with a server apparatus, which manages a print order and has a spool unit for storing a print job and intermediate data of the print job, and a printer via a network. Image storage means stores the print job and the intermediate data of the print job to be executed according to a print request. List acquisition means acquires a list of print jobs managed by the server apparatus. Job designation means designates a print job to be previewed based on the list of print jobs acquired by the list acquisition means. Determination means determines whether the intermediate data of the print job designated by the job designation means is stored in the image storage means or in the spool unit of the server apparatus. Intermediate data acquisition means is provided for, if it is determined by said determination means that the intermediate data of the print job designated by the job designation means is stored in the image storage means, reading the intermediate data from the image storage means, whereas, if it is determined by the determination means that the intermediate data is stored in the server apparatus, downloading the

intermediate data from the server apparatus. Control is provided means for displaying a preview image based on the intermediate data acquired by the intermediate data acquisition means.

Support for Claim 22 is found in the specification, at least at the section beginning at page 31 (the “fourth embodiment”).

One important feature of Claim 22 is that both the server apparatus and the client apparatus have spool functions for storing print data of a print job. In particular, in Claim 22, the intermediate data of the print job is stored in the client or the server, and whether the intermediate data is stored in the client or the server is determined by the determination means. By virtue of this feature, a preview image can be properly displayed by acquiring the intermediate data irrespective of the stored location.

As explained above, Kurachi discusses a print managing system having a plurality of clients and a printer. In Kurachi, each client generates and sends print data of a print job, and the printer produces the rough image of the print data and sends the rough image with management information to the client in response to a request signal from the client. The client displays the rough image with the management information on its display. The printer can apparently be replaced by a set of printing apparatus and a server.

Applicant notes that, in Kurachi, the print data is stored only in the print data storing means 3a in the printer apparatus (server) 3 (see, e.g., Fig. 1). The client generates and sends the print data, but does not store the print data.

The Examiner asserts that the RAM in Fig. 2B of Kurachi corresponds to the

image storing means of Claim 22. However, Applicant notes that these descriptions relate to the function of the server, and hence there is no description or indication in which the print data is also stored in the client. In Kurachi, the RAM in the client is used to temporarily store the data necessary for the CPU and the like (see, e.g., column 7, lines 48-53 of that patent), and therefore, after the generated print data has been sent to the print data storing means 3, no print data remains in the RAM.

Applicants have found nothing in Kurachi that would teach or suggest that intermediate data of the print job is stored in the client or the server, and whether the intermediate data is stored in the client or the server is determined by determination means, as in Claim 22.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claim 22 is not anticipated by Kurachi, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Independent Claims 26 and 30 are method and storage medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 22, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 22.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

This Amendment After Final Action is believed clearly to place this application in condition for allowance and, therefore, its entry is believed proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Accordingly, entry of this Amendment, as an earnest effort to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues, is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance the case to issue.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

No petition to extend the time for response to the Office Action is deemed necessary for the present Amendment. If, however, such a petition is required to make this Amendment timely filed, then this paper should be considered such a petition and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the requisite petition fee to Deposit Account 06-1205.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lock See Yu-Jahnes', written over a horizontal line.

Attorney for Applicant
Lock See Yu-Jahnes
Registration No. 38,667

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY_MAIN 423778v1